



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

On ✓  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.                  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR      | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/010,343                       | 12/05/2001  | Visvamohan Yegnashankaran | 072219-0261615 (P05089) | 7286             |
| 33402                            | 7590        | 12/16/2003                | EXAMINER                |                  |
| LAW OFFICES OF MARK C. PICKERING |             |                           | ANDUJAR, LEONARDO       |                  |
| P.O. BOX 300                     |             |                           | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
| PETALUMA, CA 94953               |             |                           | 2826                    |                  |

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                        |                        |                       |
|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Advisory Action</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b>   |
|                        | 10/010,343             | YEGNASHANKARAN ET AL. |
|                        | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>       |
|                        | Leonardo Andújar       | 2826                  |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 17 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 1-3,21,22,24,26 and 33-37 would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

- Claim(s) allowed: 1-3,21,22,24,26 and 33-37.
- Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) rejected: 25 and 27-32.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.
8.  The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
  9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
  10.  Other: See Continuation Sheet

*NATHAN J. FLYNN*  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Continuation of 10. Other: Applicant's arguments filed 10/17/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the Examiner did not respond to applicant's arguments regarding the location of second bonding pads. Nonetheless, applicant did not provide any specific argument regarding why the bond pads 26b disclosed by Wark cannot be considered be formed only in a central region (emphasis added). Note that the term "central region" and/or "peripheral region" are not defined. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In the response filed on May 21, 2003 applicant merely stated that the second bond pads are formed only in a periphery region. If a *prima facie* case of obviousness is established, the burden shifts to the applicant to come forward with arguments and/or evidence to rebut the *prima facie* case. See, e.g., *Dillon*, 919 F.2d at 692, 16 USPQ2d at 1901. Rebuttal evidence and arguments can be presented in the specification, *In re Soni*, 54 F.3d 746, 750, 34 USPQ2d 1684, 1687 (Fed. Cir. 1995), by counsel, *In re Chu*, 66 F.3d 292, 299, 36 USPQ2d 1089, 1094-95 (Fed. Cir. 1995), or by way of an affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.132, e.g., *Soni*, 54 F.3d at 750, 34 USPQ2d at 1687; *In re Piasecki*, 745 F.2d 1468, 1474, 223 USPQ 785, 789-90 (Fed. Cir. 1984). However, arguments of counsel cannot take the place of factually supported objective evidence. See, e.g., *In re Huang*, 100 F.3d 135, 139-40, 40 USPQ2d 1685, 1689 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *In re De Blauwe*, 736 F.2d 699, 705, 222 USPQ 191, 196 (Fed. Cir. 1984). In this case, Wark clearly shows that the second bond pads are formed only in the center region (see attachment). Applicant argues that the Examiner did not respond to the argument presented by applicant in the amendment filed on May 21, 2003 (i.e. "it is not possible for Wark to have fourth bonding pads on the top surface of the die 12 and circuit board connectors on the back surface of the die 12 because the two sides would be covered with epoxy and boded to the bottom side of die 26"). It is respectfully noted that the Examiner properly responded to this argument (see paragraph 7). Furthermore, this argument contradicts the explicit teachings of Wark. Wark clearly discloses that the IC 12 includes a plurality of fourth bond pads on its top surface (col. 5/lls.46-63). As it well known in the art and evidenced by fig. 3 the use of an epoxy layer to attach two chips does prevent the use of pads in one of its surfaces (e.g. 34). Note that arguments of counsel cannot take the place of factually supported objective evidence. See, e.g., *In re Huang*, 100 F.3d 135, 139-40, 40 USPQ2d 1685, 1689 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *In re De Blauwe*, 736 F.2d 699, 705, 222 USPQ 191, 196 (Fed. Cir. 1984). In any case, the substrate 12 can also be recognized as the claimed package's substrate and the bond pads 36 as the plurality of bond pads. .

